

REMARKS:

These remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed November 13, 2007, in which claims 1, 6-16 and 19-28 are pending. Claims 1, 5-16 and 19-28 stand rejected.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-8, 11 (also claims 12-13 on page 7 of the Office Action), 19-20 and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad Jr. et al. (5,079,839, hereinafter "Conrad") in view of Brown Jr. et al. (6,852,262, hereinafter "Brown"), further in view of Allan et al. (6,238,612, hereinafter "Allan").

In making the rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 26 the Examiner, on pages 2, 3-4 and 5 respectively of the Office Action stated Conrad shows molding a lubricating shaving aid, but conceded that Conrad does not show a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material. The Examiner went on to state that Allan show that it is known to carry out a method including injecting a moisturizing (i.e. lubricating) soap material in flowable form into a closed mold. The Examiner alleged that it would have been prima facie obvious to include Allan's soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad in order to make the shaving aid multi-purpose (e.g. shaving aid, cleaning, moisturizing).

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The disclosure of Conrad is concerned with overcoming prior art deficiencies associated with sequentially molding a lubricating strip comprising a mixture of (high molecular weight) polyethylene oxide and polystyrene together with a cap of a razor cartridge. This is disclosed in the paragraph beginning at Col 1, line 51. No other lubricating strip composition is envisaged by Conrad. The aforementioned deficiencies noted by Conrad include degradation of the polyethylene oxide, thermal distortion of the previously-molded cap and mechanical distortion caused by unequal forces as a result of staggered shrinking. These are disclosed in the first three full paragraphs of Col 2. Conrad's solution is to provide equidistantly spaced anchoring openings in the cap (12-15) and corresponding T-shaped anchors (22-25) of the lubricating strip, each having a reduced width neck portion (22"-25"). Fig. 4 of Conrad is described as showing resultant force vectors of the cooled composite product. At Col. 4, lines 35-37 Conrad discloses that the shaving aid strip experiences a slight amount of stretching in the areas around the anchors as a result of the contractive forces exerted during cooling.

The disclosure of Allan is directed to method of forming, in a mold cavity, detergent bars having improved shape reproduction. The improved shape reproduction is achieved by

delivering further detergent material to the mold cavity as the volume in the mold decreases as it cools or by applying pressure to the material in the mold cavity from a feed of material in fluid contact with the material within the cavity. Allan fail to disclose forming the detergent bar in a closed second mold containing any other body.

The generally known properties of a soap material as recited in claims 1, 11 and 26 are that it has poor mechanical strength - for example, when the Applicants desired to produce a shaving aid cartridge for use with a razor assembly, the “features for attaching the shaving aid cartridge to (the) razor assembly” as recited in claims 1 and 11 are provided in the (thermoplastic) base and not the shaving aid body comprising the soap material. The Applicants thus contend that the method of Conrad that induces a “slight amount of stretching in the areas around the anchors” is incompatible with, and therefore implicitly teaches away from, a method for forming a shaving aid body comprising a soap material attached to a formed base. Moreover, Allan, in failing to disclose forming the detergent bar in a closed second mold containing any other body, fails to disclose or teach whether in fact the methods therein are compatible with forming the detergent bar in a closed second mold containing any other body.

The Applicants therefore contend that there is no rationale to include Allan’s soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad, as alleged by the Examiner.

In making the rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 26 the Examiner neglected to address the claimed recitation that the base has “a centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge.” This recitation is plainly not included in Conrad or Allan. Brown includes several different embodiments that include apertures, however, each and every embodiment of Brown fails to include a “centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge” as claimed. A razor cartridge, as is well known in the art, typically comprises a housing or frame having a guard and a cap, and at least one razor blade. This is described in at least paragraph [0002] of the present application, partially shown as 18 in fig. 1 and described in application serial number 10/367,255 incorporated by reference in the present application. Brown, on the other hand, is directed to methods of manufacturing razor cartridges using insert molding to capture a supported blade in a molded plastic housing. Even if, *arguendo*, the housing of Brown was considered a base in the context of the present application, this does not include an aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge. Inasmuch as Brown’s cartridge includes an aperture (as best seen if fig. 1 and 1A) it is not sized to receive a razor cartridge but is sized to

capture a supported razor blade by encasing the ends of the blade in resin (as best seen in fig. 1B). Furthermore the supported blade of Brown Jr. is not received in the aperture but rather the aperture is created partially along two elongated sides of the blade. Even if the device of Brown was modified to remove the supported razor blade it would fail to function as disclosed, i.e. as a razor cartridge.

As previously mentioned, the Applicants contend that there is no rationale to include Allan's soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad, as alleged by the Examiner. The Applicants also contend that none of Conrad, Brown or Allan, individually or in combination disclose, teach or suggest at least the limitation "a base having a centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge" in independent claims 1, 11 and 26. Dependent claims, by definition, further define the subject matter of the independent claim from which they depend. Because claims 6-8 and 19-20 depend from claim 1, claims 12-13 and 24-25 depend from claim 11 and claims 27-28 depend from claim 26, these claims add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claims 1, 11 and 26. As claims 1, 11 and 26 are believed to be allowable, claims 6-8, 12-13, 19-20, 24-25 and 27-28 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 6-8, 11-13, 19-20, 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-10, 14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Brown, and Allan in view of Vreeland et al. (5,345,680, hereinafter "Vreeland").

The disclosure of Vreeland is directed to a shaving aid for use with a wet razor comprising a water insoluble polymeric material including at least two different polymers, and a water soluble active ingredient, such as polyethylene oxide.

The Applicants contend that Vreeland fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Brown and Allan at least as these apply to the recitations of claims 1 and 11 of "a base having a centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge." Vreeland also fails provide any rationale to include Allan's soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad. Because claims 9-10 and 21 depend from claim 1 and claim 14 depends from claim 11, these claims add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 11. As claims 1 and 11 are believed to be allowable, claims 9-10, 14 and 21 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to

reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 9-10, 14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan in view of Vreeland.

The Examiner rejected claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan, in view of Vreeland, further in view of Reischl (4,595,709).

The disclosure of Reischl is directed to polyaddition products containing urethane groups produced by reacting an isocyanate group containing distillation residue with a compound having a molecular weight less than 600 containing at least two alcoholic hydroxyl groups. The polyaddition products are useful as molding compositions, reactive fillers and starting materials in the production of flame-resistant polyurethane plastics.

The Applicants contend that Reischl fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Brown, Allan and Vreeland at least as these apply to the recitation of claim 11 of "a base having a centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge." Reischl also fails provide any rationale to include Allan's soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad. Because claims 15-16 depend from claim 11, these claims add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claim 11. As claim 11 is believed to be allowable, claims 15-16 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan in view of Vreeland and further in view of Reischl.

The Examiner rejected claims 22, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan in view of Vreeland, further in view of Brams (5,788,995).

Brams discloses after a thermoplastic synthetic resin has been injection molded onto a transfer plate in a thermoplastic injection mold, the transfer plate is shifted into a silicone injection mold maintained at a high temperature and a silicone member is injection molded onto the thermoplastic member.

The Applicants contend that Brams fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Brown, Allan and Vreeland at least as these apply to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 of "a base having a centrally located aperture sized to receive a razor cartridge." Brams also fails provide any rationale to include Allan's soap material in the lubricating shaving aid of Conrad. Because claims 22-23 depend from claim 1 and claim 25 depends from claim 11,

these claims add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 11. As claims 1 and 11 are believed to be allowable, claims 22-23 and 25 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 22-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad, Brown and Allan in view of Vreeland and further in view of Brams.

SUMMARY:

In summary, the Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the present application be passed onto allowance.

Authorization is given to charge the fee for the requested two-month extension to Deposit Account No 50-4112. The Applicants believe that no additional fees are due with the filing of the present response, however, if any additional fees are deemed due, authorization is given to charge the same Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

By /David C. Coffin/
David C. Coffin
Registration No. 57,908

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457-1532
Phone: (860) 632-7200
Fax: (860) 632-8269